

REMARKS

Claims 1-71 are pending.

Applicants thank Examiner Jones for the indication on page 28, item 10 of the Office Action that claims 44-46 recite allowable subject matter, and indication on page 29, item 12 of the Office Action that claims 47-54 are allowed.

For the following reasons, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103:

On page 4, item 4 of the Office Action, claims 1-3, 5, 6, and 71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cho et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0186485), in view of Cote et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,170,938). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

It is respectfully submitted that Cho and Cote, either individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest that each of the ENAV units has a size less than a predetermined size, as recited in claim 1.

It is acknowledged in the Office Action that Cho is deficient, but it is asserted that Cote remedies this deficiency of Cho. Applicants respectfully note that Cote fails to remedy the deficiency of Cho because Cote fails to disclose that each of the ENAV units has a size less than a predetermined size. Instead, Cote discloses that a buffer is used between a transcoder and a decoder to achieve a constant bit rate transfer since MPEG-2 video produces a variable bit rate stream. In view of the produced variable bit rate stream of MPEG-2 video, Cote discloses that size of the buffer will determine the allowable frame size variation of the MPEG-2 video (see, col. 2, lines 37-44 of Cote). As such, it is the variation in size which requires the transcoder to monitor the buffer to prevent underflow/overflow (see col. 6, lines 60-col.7, lines 5 of Cote).

That is, instead of discussing ENAV units, which are recited in claim 1 as constituting interactive data, and being distinct from AV data, Cote discusses MPEG-2 video. Further, Cote simply discusses a size of the buffer in stating that the size of the buffer determines the frame size variation of the MPEG-2 video. Thus, Cote does not even discuss the size of MPEG-2

video, let alone a predetermined size of each of the ENAV units, and instead, addresses the problems caused by the variable frame size in an MPEG stream. Thus, Cote fails to disclose that each of the ENAV units has a size less than a predetermined size, or why the frame sizes in the MPEG-2 video should be applied to the script files of Cho. Accordingly, Cote fails to remedy the deficiency of Cho.

Based on the above, Cho and Cote, either individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest each and every feature of claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the applied references and their combination. Claims 2, 3, 5, 6, and 71, which depend from claim 1, are likewise patentably distinguishable over the applied references and their combination for at least the reasons discussed above, and for the additional features they recite. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

On page 6, item 5 of the Office Action, claims 4 and 7-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cho et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0186485), in view of Cote et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,170,938), as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Lamkin et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0278729). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, Cho, in view of Cote, fails to disclose each and every feature of claim 1, from which claims 4 and 7-13 depend. As Lamkin fails to remedy the deficiencies in Cho and Cote, claims 4 and 7-13 are likewise patentably distinguishable over the applied references and their combination for at least the reasons discussed above, and for the additional features they recite. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

On page 9, item 6 of the Office Action, claims 14-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cho et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0186485), in view of Cote et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,170,938), in view of Lamkin et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0278729). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

It is respectfully submitted that Cho, Cote, and Lamkin, either individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest that each of the ENAV units is smaller than a predetermined size, as recited in claims 14 and 18, or that at least one ENAV page is smaller

than a predetermined size, as recited in claim 19.

It is acknowledged in the Office Action that Cho is deficient, but it is asserted that Cote remedies this deficiency of Cho. Applicants respectfully note that Cote fails to remedy the deficiency of Cho because Cote fails to disclose that each of the ENAV units is smaller than a predetermined size. Instead, Cote discloses that a buffer is used between a transcoder and a decoder to achieve a constant bit rate transfer since MPEG-2 video produces a variable bit rate stream. In view of the produced variable bit rate stream of MPEG-2 video, Cote discloses that size of the buffer will determine the allowable frame size variation of the MPEG-2 video (see, col. 2, lines 37-44 of Cote). As such, it is the variation in size which requires the transcoder to monitor the buffer to prevent underflow/overflow (see col. 6, lines 60-col.7, lines 5 of Cote).

That is, instead of discussing ENAV units being distinct from AV data, Cote discusses MPEG-2 video. Further, Cote simply discusses a size of the buffer in stating that the size of the buffer determines the frame size variation of the MPEG-2 video. Thus, Cote does not even discuss the size of MPEG-2 video, let alone a predetermined size of each of the ENAV units or an ENAV page, and instead, addresses the problems caused by the variable frame size in an MPEG stream. Thus, Cote fails to disclose that each of the ENAV units or the ENAVE page is smaller than a predetermined size, or why the frame sizes in the MPEG-2 video should be applied to the script files of Cho. Accordingly, Cote fails to remedy the deficiency of Cho.

Further, as Lamkin fails to remedy the deficiencies in Cho and Cote, Cho, Cote, and Lamkin, either individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest each and every feature of claims 14, 18, and 19. Accordingly, claims 14, 18, and 19 are patentably distinguishable over the applied references and their combination. Claims 15-17, which depend from claim 14, claims 20-22, which depend from claim 19, are likewise patentably distinguishable over the applied references and their combination for at least the reasons discussed above, and for the additional features they recite. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

On page 17, item 7 of the Office Action, claims 23-43 and 70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lamkin et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0278729), in view of Cote et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,170,938). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

It is respectfully submitted that Lamkin and Cote, either individually or in combination, fail

to disclose or suggest that each of the ENAV units has a size that is less than a predetermined size, as recited in claim 23, or that each of the ENAV units is smaller than a predetermined size, as recited in claims 32, 33, and 36.

It is acknowledged in the Office Action that Lamkin is deficient, but it is asserted that Cote remedies this deficiency of Lamkin. Applicants respectfully note that Cote fails to remedy the deficiency of Lamkin because Cote fails to disclose that each of the ENAV units has a size less than a predetermined size, or is smaller than a predetermined size. Instead, Cote discloses that a buffer is used between a transcoder and a decoder to achieve a constant bit rate transfer since MPEG-2 video produces a variable bit rate stream. In view of the produced variable bit rate stream of MPEG-2 video, Cote discloses that size of the buffer will determine the allowable frame size variation of the MPEG-2 video (see, col. 2, lines 37-44 of Cote). As such, it is the variation in size which requires the transcoder to monitor the buffer to prevent underflow/overflow (see col. 6, lines 60-col.7, lines 5 of Cote).

That is, instead of discussing ENAV units, which are recited in claims 23, 32, 33, and 36 as constituting interactive data, and being distinct from AV data, Cote discusses MPEG-2 video. Further, Cote simply discusses a size of the buffer in stating that the size of the buffer determines the frame size variation of the MPEG-2 video. Thus, Cote does not even discuss the size of MPEG-2 video, let alone a predetermined size of each of the ENAV units, and instead, addresses the problems caused by the variable frame size in an MPEG stream. Thus, Cote fails to disclose that each of the ENAV units has a size less than a predetermined size, or is smaller than a predetermined size, or why the frame sizes in the MPEG-2 video should be applied to the scripts of Lamkin. Accordingly, Cote fails to remedy the deficiency of Lamkin.

Based on the above, Lamkin and Cote, either individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest each and every feature of claims 23, 32, 33, and 36. Accordingly, claims 23, 32, 33, and 36 are patentably distinguishable over the applied references and their combination. Claims 24-31 and 70, which depend from claim 23, claims 34 and 35, which depend from claim 32, and claims 37-43, which depend from claim 36, are likewise patentably distinguishable over the applied references and their combination for at least the reasons discussed above, and for the additional features they recite. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

On page 23, item 8 of the Office Action, claims 55-59 and 62-67 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lamkin et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0278729), in view of Cote et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,170,938), in view of Cho et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0186485). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

It is respectfully submitted that Lamkin, Cote, and Cho, either individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest the units of interactive data being smaller than a predetermined size, as recited in claim 55, or the units being smaller than a predetermined size, as recited in claim 63.

It is acknowledged in the Office Action that Lamkin is deficient, but it is asserted that Cote remedies this deficiency of Lamkin. Applicants respectfully note that Cote fails to remedy the deficiency of Lamkin because Cote fails to disclose that the units are smaller than a predetermined size. Instead, Cote discloses that a buffer is used between a transcoder and a decoder to achieve a constant bit rate transfer since MPEG-2 video produces a variable bit rate stream. In view of the produced variable bit rate stream of MPEG-2 video, Cote discloses that size of the buffer will determine the allowable frame size variation of the MPEG-2 video (see, col. 2, lines 37-44 of Cote). As such, it is the variation in size which requires the transcoder to monitor the buffer to prevent underflow/overflow (see col. 6, lines 60-col.7, lines 5 of Cote).

That is, instead of discussing ENAV units being distinct from AV data, Cote discusses MPEG-2 video. Further, Cote simply discusses a size of the buffer in stating that the size of the buffer determines the frame size variation of the MPEG-2 video. Thus, Cote does not even discuss the size of MPEG-2 video, let alone a predetermined size of each of the units, and instead, addresses the problems caused by the variable frame size in an MPEG stream. Thus, Cote fails to disclose that each of the units is smaller than a predetermined size, or why the frame sizes in the MPEG-2 video should be applied to the scripts of Lamkin. Accordingly, Cote fails to remedy the deficiency of Lamkin.

Further, as Cho fails to remedy the deficiencies in Lamkin and Cote, Lamkin, Cote, and Cho, either individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest each and every feature of claims 55 and 63. Accordingly, claims 55 and 63 are patentably distinguishable over the applied references and their combination. Claims 56-59 and 62, which depend from claim 55, and claims 64-67, which depend from claim 63, are likewise patentably distinguishable over the applied references and their combination for at least the reasons discussed above, and for the additional features they recite. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

On page 27, item 9 of the Office Action, claims 60, 61, 68, and 69 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lamkin et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0278729), in view of Cho et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0186485) as applied to claims 55 and 63 above, and further in view of Kim et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0081943). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, Lamkin, in view of Cote, and in view of Cho fails to disclose each and every feature of claim 55, from which claims 60 and 61 depend, and of claim 63, from which claims 68 and 69 depend. As Kim fails to remedy the deficiencies in Lamkin, Cote, and Cho, claims 60, 61, 68, and 69 are likewise patentably distinguishable over the applied references and their combination for at least the reasons discussed above, and for the additional features they recite. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER:

On page 28, item 10 of the Office Action, claims 44-46 are indicated as reciting allowable subject matter.

On page 29, item 12 of the Office Action, claims 47-54 are indicated as allowed.

CONCLUSION:

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 503333.

Respectfully submitted,

STEIN, MCEWEN & BUI, LLP

Date: 12/1/2008
1400 Eye St., NW
Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 216-9505
Facsimile: (202) 216-9510

By: Seth S. Kim
Seth S. Kim
Registration No. 54,577